

Application No.: 09/922,048  
Docket No.: SS3060 US NA

Page 7

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-12 of the subject application are respectfully requested. The specification and Claim 1 have been amended.

#### **Objection to the Disclosure**

The Examiner notes several discrepancies in the specification. The discrepancies in the specification have been corrected by amendment as provided above. A discrepancy similar to those noted above at the paragraph on page 19, lines 16-20 and not cited by the Examiner was also corrected by amendment. Additionally, Applicant has also corrected an obvious typographical error in the paragraphs bridging page 3, line 31 and page 4, line 15.

#### **First Rejection Under 35 USC 103**

Claims 1-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as unpatentable over Russian Patent No 432934 (Russian Patent) in view of Canadian Patent No 739,652 (Canadian Patent).

The Examiner cites the Russian patent as making the subject invention obvious. (A translation of the reference is enclosed and has been cited under an Information Disclosure Statement). There are significant differences between the features and the purpose of the Russian Patent and those of the subject invention that preclude use of the reference to show obviousness.

First, the Russian patent is directed to improving wet treatment of fibers and the jets are used to provide a fluidized bed to enhance the exposure of the fibers to the liquid. The reference also discloses parallelization of fibers (in the MD direction per the figure) by simultaneous impingement of two fluid streams, one on each side of the fabric. However, the subject invention is not directed to parallelizing fibers in the MD direction. In the subject invention, the intent is to improve the isotropy of the nonwoven web by making the fibers less oriented, whether the fibers were oriented in the machine direction or the cross machine direction. By contrast, the Russian Patent increases the fiber orientation by parallelizing the fibers.

It is further noted that the Russian patent is offered as disclosing that the fluid is water as recited in subject claims 8 and 9. There is no indication in the translation that the fluid is water. Only the term "liquid" is used.

The Canadian Patent is offered to show that a fiber batt can be formed by carding. However, this reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Russian Patent as presented above.

It is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No.: 09/922,048  
Dock t No.: SS3060 US NA

Page 8

**Second Rejection Under 35 USC 103**

Claims 1-4, 8-10, and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as unpatentable over US Patent 6,571,441 to Kobayashi et al (Kobayashi) in view of US Patent 3,353,225 to Dodson Jr. et al (Dodson).

The Examiner offers Fig.1 of Kobayashi as disclosing that fluid jets are offset at an appreciable angle from the perpendicular with respect to the web. Kobayashi does not show this. Kobayashi only shows that the jets are offset with respect to the machine direction of the web, but the jets are still perpendicular with respect to the web. In fact, the Examiner makes the same observation in the parenthetical statement in the first paragraph on page 7 of the office action. Because Kobayashi does not disclose or suggest that fluid jets are offset at an appreciable angle from the perpendicular with respect to the web, a prima facie case of obviousness is not established.

Dodson does not add anything to cure the deficiencies of Kobayashi. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established and that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Third Rejection Under 35 USC 103**

Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of US Patent 3,873,255 to Kalwaites (Kalwaites).

Kobayashi does not render the subject claims obvious for the same reasons as noted above. Kalwaites does not add anything to cure the deficiencies of Kobayashi. As such, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that claim 13 has been deemed allowable.

Application No.: 09/922,048  
Docket No.: SS3060 US NA

Page 9

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that the foregoing is a complete response to the subject Office Action. If any matters remain for resolution, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



**FREDERICK D. STRICKLAND**  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS  
Registration No.: 39,041  
Telephone: (302) 892-7940  
Facsimile: (302) 892-7343

Dated: March 10, 2004

FDS:fgl